OR 7398
7/6/06
5a

NORTHWEST REGION
HAZARDOUS WASTE INSPECTION REPORT FOR:

UNIVAR
3950 NW Yeon Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97215
EPA ID Number ORD009227398

State of Oregon Department of Environmental Quality

Prepared by: Rebecca Paul

FILE COPY

Inspection date: June 8, and June 12, 2006
DEQ Inspector(s): Rebecca Paul, Rick Silverman
Facility Representative(s): Mr. Rob Matson, Plant General Manager. During the second visit Mr. Mark Rogers, Regional Operations Manager joined the inspection.

NOTE: All regulatory citations to 40 CFR are as adopted by Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR). Any omissions to this report are not a determination of compliance with applicable regulations.

GENERAL INFORMATION

PURPOSE

These inspections were performed to determine if Univar complies with the Federal Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) and the OAR's and standards for a generator of hazardous wastes. The US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) authorizes Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) to regulate the management of Hazardous Waste in Oregon. The purpose of these rules and regulations are to prevent leaks of hazardous wastes onto the land, into the air, or to surface or ground waters and to ensure proper handling and cleanup when leaks occur.

FACILITY BACKGROUND

The last inspection was done by DEQ occurred on October 18, 1996. There were few violations found and those violations were corrected and the facility was not referred to our Enforcement Section. On September 24, 1999, Univar was inspected by the US EPA and there were no violations found during that inspection. They are also under a federal EPA clean up order for contamination found during a past hazardous waste inspection. The US EPA was going to perform an oversight inspection but due to circumstances they were unable to assist with this inspection.

GENERATOR STATUS

Univar is a Large Quantity Generator. The facility also operates as a waste broker and transporter of hazardous waste for other facilities in the Northwest. During the inspection we discussed both issues.

WASTE STREAMS

Chlorinated Solvents U080, U210, U226, U228: This waste is generated when the product lines are cleaned dry to provide for the off-loading of a different chemical. This waste stream is commonly referred as a heel waste.

Debutyl Phthalate U069: Generated by the disposal of off-specification or out-dated chemicals.

Contaminated water filters D040, U019 and various other waste codes: This waste is generated from the facility's EPA remediation project.

Absorbent pads various waste codes: This waste is generated as a result of spill clean-ups from the operation of this facility.

In general the facility can generate a wide range of waste streams and waste codes due to the nature of their business. Univar is a chemical distributor. There were also waste soils and wastewater treatment sludges generated as a result of Univar's remediation project with the US EPA.

ANNUAL REPORTS

The facility has filed annual reports and has paid the annual fees for the wastes that they generate.

FACILITY PERMITS

The facility has a water quality permit according to the facility profiler. The EPA remediation project has a water discharge with the City of Portland. Univar has no air permit.

FACILITY INSPECTION

Rick Silverman and I inspected the facility on June 8, 2006 and met with Mr. Rob Matson, Univar's Plant General Manager. We explained the nature of the visit and the inspection procedures. Mr. Matson wanted to know what files we wanted to review so that he could have someone to locate the files needed while we toured the facility's

operation. I provided him with a list, but in addition to the normal requested documents I also requested to review some of the facility's waste transporter files because Univar also operates as a waste broker. There were some problems with the paperwork observed at other regulated facilities and some changes had been made to manifests by Univar employees. I gave him the names of the customer records I wanted to see.

We went through Univar's Health and Safety procedures before proceeding with the process area. The first location we visited was the chemical transfer area. Chemicals are received from the semi-trucks and rail cars and are transferred to tanks and eventually to 55 gallon drums. In this area the transfer lines need to be cleaned and any residual chemicals are placed in satellite accumulation drums. Compatible flushings are placed together. There were four drums of satellite waste in this area. The drums were all labeled correctly. Next to these containers was one five-gallon bucket that was not labeled. The material had an odor of oil. I asked where the container had come from. I was told by one of the operators that it is used oil. We explained to them that they needed to label that container and close it.

As we were leaving this area I noticed that there were two drums with hazardous labels. I asked Mr. Matson about the drums. He said that this was not a hazardous waste storage area and that he did not know about these containers. The dates on the drums were 04/29/05 and 10/15/05. Both of these drums were over the 90-day accumulation period for an LQG. We then proceeded to look at other containers that are being stored in this area.

There were several containers of concern. We were told by Mr. Matson that these materials contained products but many of the containers were marked as containing "waste". I informed him that I wanted to take samples of the materials in some of these containers and that I would need to return to the site on Monday June 12. 2006 with sampling equipment. One container was labeled as Glycol Ether EB from spill dated 05/28/04. There were two of these drums. There were also five containers of a pesticide material from a company called Kopcoat. Mr. Matson stated that all of these drums contained products.

During the site visit on June 12, 2006 we were joined by Mr. Mark Rogers, Regional Operations Manager. In the case of the drum marked as Glycol Ether EB the product claim was determined to be untrue. The drum was an open-top drum and was filled with spill pads and booms. I told them that this waste is subjected to performing a waste determination. Mr. Rogers agreed with us. We discussed the waste stream and agreed that the waste would most likely be a non-hazardous waste.

The next three drums were labeled as Wood life waste F-15. The dates on the containers were 10/24/05. We were told that these drums had been collected during the cleaning of a storage tank for a Kopcoat product. Univar handles the storage and distribution of the chemicals for a company called Kopcoat. The label on the drum stated that the material in the drum was 40% sludge and 60% water. It was also written that the containers stated it

was "waste". However, when both Mr. Rogers and Mr. Matson were asked about these containers they stated that these containers were storing a product. There were four drums of this material on site. When I returned to the facility, the drums were labeled with a hazard class label of flammable. They supplied me with an email stating that Kop Coat was going to sample the material and that 10 drums of the material had been shipped back to the Kop Coat facility. According to Mr. Matson the material could be used by an old customer of Kopcoat's located in another state. They said that Kopcoat had switched the formulation and their customers in the Northwest were no longer using this product. We collected a sample from two of the drums. These samples were not the same color and there was a considerable amount of solids present in one of the containers.

The last drum of concern was a 15 gallon drum which was rusted and was labeled as containing a pesticide. The container was marked with the word "waste". During the first inspection it was stated that this drum also contained a product. I asked them how they were going to open the container because it appeared to be rusted shut. During the second site visit Univar representatives stated that they would be disposing that container as a waste. We took photographs of the container and the product label which discusses product storage and the need for the product to be stored out of wet conditions. The fact that it was rusted shut indicated that the product was not being handled or stored properly.

After we had made observations in this storage area on June 8, 2006, we spent more time looking at other areas that were considered to be product storage areas. There were no other problems found in other product storage locations. We proceeded to the main waste storage area for the facility. There were only two hazardous waste drums located in this area. Both of these drums were in compliance.

We also inspected the 10-day transfer area. These drums were for the facility's hazardous waste transportation services. No problems were found in this area. Located in this area we found some aerosol cans that are used to mark out old labels on containers. We asked Mr. Matson about aerosol can disposal. He told us that they use the contents of the cans and then dispose of the empty containers in the trash. We informed him that the cans are not really considered empty and that they are considered a hazardous waste because of the propellants. Aerosol cans are considered a reactive waste, (D003) and the cans need to be punctured and/or disposed of properly.

In the rear of the property is Univar's EPA remediation operation. There Univar generates waste from operating a groundwater cleanup operation. The water is run through a filtering process and the filtered water is discharged under a permit with the City of Portland. Hazardous waste is generated from the filtering units. There were two drums of hazardous waste in this area. The operator stated that these containers were satellite containers. There is a limitation of 55 gallons of waste in the area in order to be considered a satellite collection operation. The date on one container was May 31, 2006 and the other container was dated June 6, 2006. This indicated that there was an excess of 55-gallons of waste in the satellite area. The facility is required to move storage drums to

the waste storage area within three days of being full. The storage drum had been stored in this area in an excess of the three day time period. According to the operator the drum would be moved that day.

The last working area that we inspected was the lab. Mr. Matson informed me that the waste in lab would be reduced substantially. Univar had been testing products for a plating client but they are no longer supplying that customer with chemicals. There were two small satellite containers in the lab to store waste. Those containers were in compliance.

Mr. Silverman asked Mr. Matson about fluorescent light tube management. Mr. Matson took us to an area where the light tubes were stored. The box storing the tubes was not labeled or dated. On June 12, 2006 when we returned to the site it was determined that the light tubes were new tubes and not used light tubes. All of the waste tubes had been removed from the facility and they had no universal waste on-site. We concluded the facility walk-through of the inspection and returned to the office to review the files.

SATELLITE ACCUMULATION AREAS

Univar has two satellite accumulation areas. The first area is located near where the tanker cars and trucks are off-loaded. There are four drums of waste in the area and they are used to collect the heels from the off-loading process. The four drums represent the different hazard classes and waste profiles.

The second satellite area is in wastewater treatment area which is part of the US EPA remediation project. In this area, the date on one container indicated that it was beyond the three day transfer limit. The drum needs to be moved to the storage area within three days otherwise the satellite area would be over the 55-gallon limitation requirement.

90 DAY STORAGE AREAS

There is one area on-site designated as the facility's hazardous waste storage area. There were two drums of waste in this area and they were in compliance.

There was a second location at the facility where two hazardous waste drums were discovered as a result of the inspection. Mr. Matson was not aware that these containers existed until we brought them to his attention. These drums were over the 90-day storage limitation. There were other containers in this area that had the words, "waste" written on the containers. Mr. Matson stated that the materials in those drums were products so I requested to take samples of these containers. When they were sampled some of them were found to contain wastes.

RECORD REVIEW

We reviewed the Univar's manifest and LDR forms, and the material safety data sheets for products. The MSDS request were related to the materials found in the transfer area which were marked as, "Waste".

We also reviewed the facility's training records, spill contingency plan, drum inspection logs, and emergency notifications of the local authorities.

Because Univar offers waste broker services we also reviewed some transporter manifests for their clients. I provided them with copies of some customer manifests where I had discovered problems.

Spill Contingency Plan

The facility had a spill contingency plan. The plan met the requirements and no violations were found. The facility has also sent emergency notifications to local authorities.

Training Records

The facility maintains training records for their employees who manage hazardous waste. The training met the requirements.

Waste Manifests/LDRs

Univar's manifests were reviewed. With respect to the manifests related to Univar's waste there was one manifest during the initial review that did not appear to have the disposal facility signed copy. That manifest problem was resolved during the second site visit and it was discovered that the manifest was actually for another Univar facility in Oregon not for this location.

The manifest review also included some manifests that were the result of the facility's transportation services. I provided some copies of some manifests that were reviewed at other facilities where problems were found. Univar as the transporter had made changes to the manifests that they are not authorized to make. All changes must be approved by the generator of the waste because they are ultimately responsible for all wastes they generate. I also pointed out these changes would also apply to the number of transporters Univar added onto the manifests after the initial shipment is made. When the manifest is not being received from the disposal within a certain time limit, the generator needs to know who to contact. They would not be able to do this because Univar added the transporters on to the shipment without their knowledge.

Inspection records

The weekly drum inspection records were reviewed. Univar had not noticed there were several hazardous waste containers in the bulking area that were not being managed. There were only a few problems noted on the inspection sheets but the corrections to

those problems were not noted. We made some recommendations to the inspection sheets to make them more interactive such as documenting resolutions.

EXIT INTERVIEW

We had two discussions regarding the issues found at the facility. The facility had made some changes to correct some of the problems that were found during the first site visit. We discussed the waste determination issues. Univar decided that some of the materials found in the first satellite area would be handled as a waste. The drum labeled as containing the spilled Glycol ether actually contained booms and spill pads and not as a product as I was originally told. Those drums would be handled as waste. The other small fifteen-gallon drum of pesticide will also be disposed and handled as waste.

The last four drums of tank rinsate which were marked as waste were sampled by the DEQ. Univar stated that they would get back to me on how they wanted to handle this material. I informed them that if they wanted to handle it as a product I would want to see a bill of sale or purchase order for the material. They stated that the material had been tested. I requested to see those results. On June 12, 2006, Univar notified the DEQ that they were going to handle these last drums as waste as well. They stated that the pesticide in the material was too diluted to be effective as a pesticide product.

With the transfer area in general, Mr. Matson stated that part of the problem was that two managers had control of that area. As a result no one person had the control or responsibility. Now there is only one manager responsible for that area.

Information requests

I have requested lab data for the drums of waste that was done as a result of an email that was given to me to document management of the material.

CONCLUSIONS

There were several violations found at the facility. Univar needs to do a waste determination on the drums that were located in the first satellite collection area. They needed to label the small container as storing used oil. During the second visit they stated that they placed the used oil into a used oil drum. There were two drums of hazardous waste that were over the 90-day storage limit. Those drums were moved to the waste storage area. They need to manage waste collected in the satellite area and move the waste into a container within the three day time period. That drum was also moved to the 90 day storage area during the second visit.

RECOMMENDATIONS

A referral will be sent to the Enforcement Section.

POST INSPECTION ISSUES

The facility seems to have made an effort to correct some of the problems discovered as a result of this inspection. They have changed the management of the off loading area so that wastes are not collected in that location without attention. Univar may want to focus some attention on training and internal audits.